

to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice. Richards v. United States, 67 F. Supp. 2d 1321, 1322 (M.D. Ala. 1999); McCoy v. Macon Water Auth., 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

In this case, Plaintiff attempts to show that reconsideration is necessary to correct a clear error of law or prevent a manifest injustice. Plaintiff argues that the Court erroneously applied the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel, and the statute of limitations in dismissing his case. Even if the Rooker-Feldman doctrine or the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel do not apply to Plaintiff's 1999 claim, regarding the selling of condemned property to a private citizen for profit, this claim, as well as his 1994 claim, is still time-barred under the statute of limitations. As detailed in the Court's original Orders, Plaintiff's claims allege violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the two-year statute of limitations for personal injury claims is applied to these actions. Wallace v. Kato, 549 U.S. 384, 387 (2007); see Kelly v. Serna, 87 F.3d 1235, 1238 (11th Cir. 1996). Because Plaintiff's claims arose in 1994 and 1999, well over 10 years ago, all of Plaintiff's claims have expired under the statute of limitations, and the Court correctly dismissed this case.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 20] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 22nd day of January, 2010.

S/ C. Ashley Royal
C. ASHLEY ROYAL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APG/ssh